

SPEECH

— ON —

THE BUDGET

Delivered in the House of Commons
July 22nd, 1891,

— BY —

NICHOLAS FLOOD DAVIN, M. P.



REGINA :
THE LEADER CO., [Limited.]
PRINTERS & PUBLISHERS.
1891.



199438...

5081
365

DE

M

most
have
notic
discu
prop
one
anoth
about
in oc
then
and M
the p
gentle
comm
the a
histor
count
mem
as clo
portio
migh
the h
came
the c
and
affect
durin
phras
am in
distan
very
hears
shoul
us ex
that
mony
of th
coun

Speech on the Budget.

DELIVERED IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS JULY 22nd, 1891,

—BY—

NICHOLAS FLOOD DAVIN, M. P.

Mr. Speaker, I will not imitate most of the hon. gentlemen who have preceded me in this debate. I have noticed that the plan pursued in this discussion—if indeed discussion be the proper word to describe it—has been, that one hon. gentleman has risen after another, and having said a few words about what his opponent or predecessor in occupation of the floor had said, he then went into a long essay on the Trade and Navigation Returns. In fact, I had the pleasure of listening to one hon. gentleman who only failed to have commenced with Noah descending from the ark, for he went back to the remotest history, and took us over a large tract of country. Sir, I will follow the hon. member from Arthabaska (Mr. Lavergne) as closely as I can, in regard to all that portion of his speech which I think he might claim worthy of consideration at the hands of this house. He said that he came to give his testimony as to what was the condition of things in his own county, and how the policy of the Government affected the people in his county, and during his remarks he frequently used the phrase: "I am informed." Well, Sir, I am informed that the hon. gentleman is a distinguished lawyer, and he must know very well that even in political matters hearsay evidence is not very valuable. I should have much preferred had he given us exactly what he had seen himself, so that we might have had his direct testimony as to the dolorous effect of the policy of the Government in the part of the country to which he belongs. The hon.

gentleman commenced by talking of a "cloud about the size of a man's hand;" a phrase used by my hon. friend from Albert (Mr. Weldon), and he went on to refer to the Corn Laws, and he declared that the feeling in England to-day was very much the same as it was at the time of the Corn Laws, and that any attempt to ask England to modify her fiscal policy so as to meet the desires of her colonies in general, and this colony in particular, was utterly futile. Is the hon. gentleman aware of the tone held by the *Times* newspaper, the leading organ of public opinion in England? Is the hon. gentleman aware of the tone held by such a paper as the *Economist*, probably the greatest journalistic organ on fiscal matters in the world? Is the hon. gentleman aware that there is a great change of feeling in England, and that in fact, that deification of Richard Cobden that once existed there has passed away; and that the general feeling prevails, as though Carlyle's estimate of him was the correct estimate, when he said in his humorous way, that he regarded Richard Cobden as an inspired bag-man who believed in a calico millenium. (Laughter.) Now, Mr. Speaker, I happen to have here an estimate by a distinguished financial authority.

Mr. Amyot. That is hearsay evidence.

Mr. Davin. If my hon. friend will spare me his suggestions I shall be very glad, because I am sure neither light nor sweetness come from these. I have here, Mr. Speaker, a suggestion made by a distinguished financial authority, and it is a suggestion that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, or whoever representing the Government may go down to

Washington, will do well to bear in mind. He is dealing with the McKinley Bill, and he points out cogently and powerfully how England ought to deal with the United States with regard to that measure. All he says bears on the very question raised in the first sentence of the speech of my hon. and learned friend from Arthabasca (Mr. Lavergne). He regards the McKinley Bill as a retaliatory measure, and, *en passant*, he points out that it enables Brazil to favour the United States against England. He declares that the McKinley Bill is a retaliatory measure, and that England is bound to retaliate. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to commit myself to the proposition that I would, under any circumstances, favour retaliatory legislation. I am not dealing with that point; I am discussing the point raised by my hon. friend when he said there was no change in opinion in England with regard to this matter, and as to whether we may or may not expect that England would modify her tariff in another direction than the free trade direction, with a view to affect other tariffs, such as that of the United States. I may say here, that I was perfectly astonished to hear from the hon. gentleman who so ably represents South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) the statement that the Government of Canada, with bated breath and whispered humbleness, had to come down the moment a change took place in the tariff of the country to the south of the line. We know very well, Sir, that the incidence of commerce is so delicate that if any nation on the continent of Europe were to modify its tariff in any given way, it would be for any contiguous nation to consider whether it should not modify its tariff too. There are some staples that we import from the United States that if we were to deal with in the spirit of this McKinley Bill it would be a matter for the Secretary of State of the United States to consider whether he would not in turn deal with the tariff on such article in an equitable way, corresponding with the change that had taken place in the contiguous country. Here let me pause to call attention to the closing sentence in the speech of the hon.

member for South Brant (Mr. Patterson). I will speak in the spirit of that sentence, and I will ask that for the remainder of this debate hon. gentlemen on my own side of the House—and it is a very Irish position, because it is the other side—as well as hon. gentlemen on this side, will speak and act and vote in the spirit of these words. I will try to vote in their spirit myself; and if the hon. member for South Oxford were here I would ask him to analyse his resolution for me, to show me that the two parts of that resolution hang together, and then that the whole will be beneficial, and if he did that he might find me voting with him.

Mr. Laurier. You are boasting.

Mr. Davin. My hon. friend is too egotistical to suppose that it would be boasting on my part to speak of voting on his side. This is what the hon. member for South Brant said:

"While I may not have convinced him, I trust that by examining each other's views from our different points of view, we may both find our minds enlarged, and may endeavour to promote legislation in this House which shall be for the best interests of the people of Canada."

No nobler words were ever spoken in any legislative assembly. (Cheers, cries of hear, hear).

Mr. Davin. I am glad hon. gentlemen cheer, and would to God men on both sides of the House would go into the debate in that spirit. Then we should not have the kind of debate which we constantly witness. I do not conceal—it may be impertinent on my part not to conceal it—that I utterly disapprove of the character of the debate. We should have a mutual discussion among ourselves as to what will be the best, instead of discussing a definite financial issue with all the heated passions of partizans. Every year we have a discussion on this financial issue, and it reminds me of the etymology of the word "debate." As the hon. leader of the Opposition knows, it is derived from the French word *debatre*, which in turn is derived from the old French word *batre*, which means to beat, to lay on; and it is in that meaning that we apply the word here, instead of in that proper meaning which now holds—to interchange opinions, to cross swords in

argument, to fight out issues, and then come to conclusions. But what has happened here? There has been no joining of issues whatever, no swords crossed; but in fact we have been beating the air and talking wildly. Now, to show my hon. friend that it is possible that England might change, Mr. William J. Harris proposes retaliation, a tax on the corn and provisions of the United States; and he shows pretty clearly in the *Economist* of the 14th of March last, that this need not and probably would not cause the cry of dear bread to be raised; and we know that in the main free trade means cheap bread. Hon. gentlemen speak of England being a free trade country, as if everything came into England free. We know that is not the case; that free trade there meant not the abolition, but rather the modification of the laws dealing with breadstuffs. Take wheat. England requires about 17,500,000 quarters, or 140,000,000 bushels annually. The wheat exporting power of the world, leaving out the United States, is 224,800,000 bushels. The export from Canada is about 5,000,000 bushels, and that from Argentina, 8,000,000 bushels; and the output from both these countries is likely to increase enormously. Give Russia, with her export of 96,000,000 bushels, and the other exporting countries preferential terms in the English markets and they would prefer to direct their supplies to Great Britain rather than to Italy, Spain, Germany, or France, all of which impose duties varying from 18½ to 25 cents a bushel. But, as a fact, England might soon rely on her own possessions, India exporting 32,000,000 bushels, Australia 12,000,000, and Canada 5,000,000, or 49,000,000 bushels out of the 140,000,000 bushels required by England. Anyway it is clear that action on the part of England, challenged by the McKinley Bill, would deprive the United States farmers of the English market. How serious a thing this would be may be gathered from the fact that in 1889 the United States exported to England 36·69 per cent. of the 140,000,000 bushels she required, and in 1887 61·45 per cent. It would be necessary, of course, to place an

import duty on wheat and flour imported from Holland, in order to make the retaliation complete. With regard to maize and meat, of which last Great Britain is almost the sole importer, she would be still more independent. Roumania, Turkey, Russia, and Argentine can grow maize quite as cheaply as the United States. Canadians would find a better market than they have even now in England, and we send six and a half millions there. The American agriculturists would either have to keep maize and meat at home or else compete in the English market with other countries on unequal terms. What a row there would be then in the United States. You would have the United States farmer pretty well discontented with McKinley Bills and the authors of them. England, then, is now in a position to retaliate. I do not say that she will retaliate; but she could without raising the cry of dear bread—and it is the cry of dear bread that Lord Salisbury is afraid of—effectively do so. Mark these figures. England takes from the United States \$477,500,000 worth of farm produce and manufactures; take from this the raw materials of manufacture, such as wool and cotton, amounting to \$167,500,000, and you have \$310,000,000 worth of imports, on which, without doing the British people the least injury an import duty could be imposed. Look at the other side. \$151,500,000 is all that Great Britain exports to the United States, and this goes in over a tariff wall so high that it may be fairly described as prohibitive. England, therefore, has a fourfold power of retaliation if she wishes to use it; and the sooner, probably, she menaces the use of it the better, for the moment she menaced the use of it I believe the Americans would come down; because, after all, if I were negotiating with American diplomatists I would remember the American character; I would remember that it is a commercial character; that it is a character without the fighting quality or without the point of honour that belongs to a people partly military and partly commercial. Where you have a purely commercial community you have some virtues that will not

flourish in a military community. You will have a wide humanity, you will have the domestic virtues very strong, but the sentiment of honour will be weak and chivalry will be at a discount; and you will find that the moment you point to their self interest, the moment you show them they are likely, in any way, to suffer in the pocket, that moment they will come round to your views. My hon. friend beside me whispers that I am becoming too philosophical. If I have soared too high for my hon. friend I will now come down to his understanding. The great Seldon, when he used to come down to the old Bailey to defend a man, always took a half-gallon of porter, in order, as he would say, to bring down his understanding to the level of the jury. (Laughter). And, Sir, whatever assembly a man is addressing he ought to bring down his understanding to the level of that assembly. (Hear, hear.) Now, my hon. friend from Arthabasca (Mr. Lavergne) will see that when you find a man of the distinction of Mr. Harris and the economists of London discussing the question, it is not at all such an unlikely thing that England—and it will be remembered that during the time of Napoleon we had a war of commercial devices between America, France, and England—it is not at all unlikely that England will take it into her head to retaliate, and she might menace retaliation with the utmost safety. If she did, the result would be that our negotiators, when they do go down next autumn to Washington, would have a very easy course indeed. My hon. friend from Arthabasca, unfortunately for the value of his speech in this House, dealt with what he supposed to be facts. He told us something about the indebtedness of Quebec in general and his own county in particular. He told us something about the mortgages on farms and the men who are afraid to close mortgages, and he said the Crédit-Foncier was in a difficulty in consequence. Now, I happen to have, luckily for the value of the debate and luckily also lest the speech to which we have just listened might have carried away hon. gentlemen who may, during the course of this discussion, have been

converted to the views of the Government—I happen to have here the Crédit-Foncier reports for 1891; and I find that the number given of those in arrears, against whom suits had to be taken, is 21, and of these 14 paid up before the execution of judgment, so that only 7 remained behind in meeting their engagements; and this in an amount of loans reaching a sum of \$6,600,000. (Cheers). If the rest of the hon. gentleman's facts are as shaky as those with regard to the Crédit-Foncier, the value of his testimony is very small indeed. My hon. friend went on to speak of the exodus. I am not going to deal with that subject. We hear so much of it, the dolefulness of it is such that even my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Patterson), who lately has become more cheerful, is sometimes tempted to fall back upon it in order to be in proper tune with his party. It has lain so heavily on the soul of the hon. member for North Northolt (Mr. Charlton) whom I do not see here, that he is probably confined to his room for a few days. We hear this doleful story about the exodus and the condition of Canada year after year, while, as a fact, we know that Canada is progressing, and no man who goes through the country can fail to know that it is progressing; no man whose eyes are not wilfully closed can fail to see that its productions are increasing and that the comforts of life are more diffused, as may be seen by the amount of raw cotton imported to-day compared with ten years ago, and the small prices at which cotton sells as compared with ten years ago. The hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Ives), the other evening went over the figures in regard to these matters, figures similar to those I had myself from an independent source, and there cannot be the least doubt that we are progressing. What these hon. gentlemen remind me of is a story which those of us who have classical reminiscences will remember. I refer to the old Greek story of how Proteus sets out to get the head of the Gorgon, and he has to go to hyperborean regions, behind the north wind, to see the three grey sisters and ask from them where he shall find the Gorgon. And he finds the three

grey
the m
one e
and t
old d
they
young
of a l
teus w
task,
which
onlook
emerg
of the
monot
were
they h
hero.
one wa
and th
may bi
oue to
from o
do her
pass ro
made i
see ruin
and lau
the sun
the pre
bright
and in,
and the
any ma
proph
they ha
doleful
deficits
(Cheers
fanatics
and reg
new Je
hon. g
horses,
civil la
horses.
one in
the wit
witness
times h
myself
in my ti
conscie
own int

grey sisters. There they are, beneath the moon, sitting on ice. They have only one eye among the three, and one tooth, and they sing a doleful song of how the old days were better than the present, and they hate the sun and the presence of this young, energetic Greek, half divine, and of a heroism never surpassed—this Proteus who was bound on a most dangerous task, to get the head of that Medusa, which, once looked on, would turn the onlooker into stone. The sight of this energetic being angers them like the sight of the sun, and they sing the same monotonous wail of how the old times were better than the present, and how they hate the sun and the adventurous hero. When Proteus intrudes on them one wants the eye that she may see him, and the other wants the tooth that she may bite him, and they pass the eye from one to the other, and they pass the tooth from one to the other, just as our friends do here. The tooth which our friends pass round is the exodus, and the eye was made in a Yankee workshop and can only see ruin in everything Canadian. (Cheers and laughter.) Still they hate the sun, the sun of Canada's prosperity, which at the present hour is shining above them bright and clear—aye, bright and clear and in, as nations go, an unclouded sky—and the sun of the future may be felt by any man of prophetic vision, any man of prophetic temperament, so to speak; but they hate it all, and they sing the same doleful song of how the old times of deficits were better than these days. (Cheers.) Sir, these men are political fanatics who believe in a Yankee millenium and regard the city of Washington as the new Jerusalem. (Renewed cheers.) The hon. gentleman spoke about hay, and horses, and eggs. He knows more about civil law than he knows about tariffs on horses. The case he mentions is evidently one in which he was himself engaged, and the witness he examined was probably a witness in his own case, and as we sometimes have found—because I am a lawyer myself and have examined a few witnesses in my time—witnesses, although extremely conscientious, will lean a little to their own interests, somewhat like the witness

that Daniel O'Connell examined. He asked the witness, "Of what profession are you?" The man did not understand; so at last O'Connell said: "I believe you sell milk?" "Yes," he replied; and then beneath his breath he added, "and water too." (Laughter.) Now, here is my hon. friend's calculation about horses. He says that 13,000 were sold to the United States, of which 7,000 were sold from the Province of Quebec. And he asks, Can we go on? And I am bound to say—I do not wish to be offensive, but when a man is speaking from a pessimistic point of view it is a great advantage to him to have been furnished by nature with a certain dolefulness of personality—and, I am bound to say that personality added tremendously to the effect when the hon. gentleman said: Can we go on? The McKinley tariff causes a diminution of 25 per cent. in value. Then the hon. gentleman brings forward this veracious witness whom he put into the box and who says that he could have got, before the McKinley Bill became law, \$120 for the horse for which he could only now get \$90. Under the McKinley tariff, horses up to \$150 are charged \$30 per head, so that when you take off \$30 from \$120 that leaves \$90. But before the McKinley Bill there was a duty of 20 per cent. charged. That would be \$24. The difference between \$24 and \$30 is \$6 (cheers,) so what you would have to take off the \$120 is \$6, and that would give you \$114 and not the \$90 that this witness, after the pattern that O'Connell has immortalized, was imposing on my friend or some other counsel. My hon. friend, no doubt, is a very good lawyer, but he does not understand much political economy, and it is as true in statesmanship as it is in regard to lawyers and others—*ne sutor*. (Laughter and cheers.) With your permission, I will ask the House to bear with me while I look at this resolution. It has been read several times, so I will not read it again, but there are two parts to it. There is the first part which says it is necessary to reduce the duty on all the prime necessities of life, and the next part is that we should have the most extended trade relations in manufactures

as well as in natural products with the United States. I am not going to be a carping critic about words, but I may say that a man with the great experience of the hon. member for South Oxford might, I think, have used more scientific phraseology than "the most extended trade relations." Why in one phrase he could have given us the statement that what we want is absolute free trade with the United States. Remember, the most extended trade relations—however, that is mere hypercriticism, and I never descend to that. (Laughter.) To begin with I object, as I believe others before have objected in this debate, that that language is vague. He says we should reduce the duties. How far? By one per cent.? By five-sixths of one per cent.? By 20 per cent.? By how much? Surely in a resolution of this kind, which is to go before the country, which is intended to influence the people and be a text on platform after platform, you should have given the people something definite. But the main necessities of life—what are these? Why not mention them? They cannot be many. But it is the main necessities of life for the farmer, the artisan, the fisherman, and the miner. Visions of fish hooks, of iron, of agricultural implements, of bread, cheese, bacon, a whole lot of things come before you. (Hear, hear.)

On what does the hon. gentleman want the reduction? Is it on bread? He cannot suppose that we want cheap bread in this country when we export so much wheat? Is it iron? My hon. friend from Addington (Mr. Dawson) spoke of iron. It sat upon the hon. gentleman's soul that the duty on iron was not reduced, or that it was not let in absolutely free. Suppose we take iron. Are you going to reduce the duty on that? Very well. Then we come to the second part. You want to reduce the duty on iron, and then you vote on the resolution that you want the most extended trade relations with the United States! What does that mean? Will anyone dare to say that you will not have to build up a wall against the importation of iron on the seaboard exactly equal to that which they have in

the United States? They want unrestricted reciprocity with the United States. But the leaders in that country have declared: "Do you suppose we are fools to allow you Cannucks, and the Britishers through you Cannucks, to deluge our country with goods from Birmingham and Sheffield? No; you must have a tariff like our own." Then, what does the hon. member for Addington and what do all the rest of them want? (Cheers). We have now a duty of \$4 a ton. What will they have to pay when this wall is raised? They will have to pay a duty of \$6 a ton. (Hear, hear). That reasoning applies to other articles *pro tanto*. I ask under which king? I interrupted last night, I think not offensively, the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) by asking him, how can you do this and have unrestricted reciprocity? One after the other has spoken on that side, but not one has explained how you are going to have these duties reduced and then go into a trade partnership with the United States, for that is what it amounts to.

Some hon. members. No.

Mr. Davin. No? I see that some hon. gentlemen can make a cuckoo cry over those benches, but not one of them, when challenged, can dare to show how they are going to do it. The leader of the Opposition is there. He is an experienced politician, he is a distinguished lawyer, he is a man of subtle intellect. I defy him to show us how he is going to do it, and I say to him that, if he can show how it can be done I will vote for his motion.

Mr. Laurier. I told you you were boasting a few minutes ago.

Mr. Davin. You are not boasting now, because you are evading the challenge. (Loud Ministerial cheers). Show me how you can have unrestricted reciprocity with the States without affecting your tariff on the seaboard. You ought to have shown it, and the member for South Oxford ought to have shown it when he tabled that resolution. But when we challenged him, what did he say? He said, in his peculiarly effective manner: I have not been called in as a physician, but when I am called in, then I will prescribe. The

he
ph
ci
th
ca
wh
ha
he
an
to
wh
non
don
any
ing
ref
the
the
(Re
gen
hav
has
suff
ther
to b
and
a liv
get
equa
sion
swal
not
neve
But
swal
the
fresh
ness
step
is we
(Loud
is M
the n
He g
this a
all c
tax-p
admit
that t
but,
produ
series
phen
Mr.

hon. gentleman is not in that position. A physician who is not called in is a physician who does not speak about the case of the patient; the physician who is not called in has nothing to do with it. But what has the hon. gentleman done? He has thrust himself into the patient's room, he has declared that he knew the disease, and he has prescribed. But I will come to the difference, if there is any, between what he has exactly done and what he has not done. I will tell you what he has done. He has done precisely what is done by any doctor who, when asked what are the ingredients against earthquakes (laughter) refuses to tell, and for the best reason in the world—that he does not know. But these doctors are usually quack doctors. (Renewed laughter.) In fact the hon. gentleman reminds me of a doctor we have up somewhere near Regina. He has a very peculiar notion about persons suffering from various diseases. Well, there was a young lady who was supposed to be suffering a little from constipation, and he prescribed that she should swallow a living frog. Well, it was impossible to get over the aversion of the patient, and equally impossible—supposing that aversion could be got over—that she could swallow the frog, because her larynx is not extraordinarily large, and the doctor never explained how that could be done. But he went about saying that she must swallow a live frog or she would die; yet the young lady trips round and the freshness of her complexion, the brightness of her eye, and the quickness of her step show that she has a good appetite, is well fed, has a good digestion, &c., &c. (Loud cheers and laughter) and her name is Miss Canada. (Cheers.) What does the member for South Oxford say further? He gives you an array of duty paid on this article, of duty paid on the other, and all coming out of the pockets of the tax-payers, every penny of it, he says. I admit, he says, I have never denied it, that these taxes are paid by the consumer; but, he says, they are paid by the producer too. So that you have here a series of taxes and you have this peculiar phenomenon in political economy—

Mr. McMullen. Finish your frog story.

Mr. Davin. Don't you croak too much. (Laughter.) In 1882, when I was sitting next to my hon. friend the Minister of Customs, and the hon. member for South Oxford was replying to Sir Charles Tupper, he said: "I have never denied, and I admit it and declare it, that the consumer pays the duty just as often as the earth goes round the sun, and the producer pays the duty just as often as the sun goes round the earth." But now he has advanced in his astronomy. He was a disciple of Gallileo when he declared that, but now he declares that not only does the earth go round the sun but that the sun goes round the earth (laughter and cheers), that is to say, that the consumer pays the duty and the producer pays the duty too, which, in the colloquial language I used to hear in other days, is "consumedly" absurd. (Cheers.) Now, I will not go into the question of how much the farmer would be affected, supposing it possible—

Mr. McMullen. Tell us the frog story again.

Mr. Davin. My hon. friend wants me to finish the frog story; but you see, Mr. Speaker, that not only has the hon. member for South Oxford, in the process of evolution, gone from the astronomical theory that the earth goes round the sun, but he now has got so far as to say that the sun goes round the earth as well, and my hon. friend from North Wellington is also in a process of evolution. The other night he was a tadpole; a few minutes ago you heard from his peculiar croak that he was just on the bridge between the tadpole stage and the frog stage, and now we find from the sound of the last croak that the full-grown toad stage has been reached. (Laughter and cheers.) Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for South Oxford makes the same statement again and again about the North-West. It has been made by others. I do not think it has ever yet been properly answered. He says in his speech that in one way and another we have spent at least a hundred millions of public money in the North-West.

Mr. Choquette. Hear, hear.

Mr. Davin. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am

very glad that there is so able and distinguished a supporter of the member for South Oxford here, when I am about to arraign his calculation. The member for South Oxford makes the statement, but he never gives us the least proof. He goes about the country in the same way; he comes here and he never gives us the least proof. He comes out with bundles of papers, he hovers around the question, he pumps up the most violent epithets he can possibly find in the deep recesses of his abyssmal hatred of everything Tory. (Laughter and cheers.) He goes on in that style, then he pours out lamentations about the safety of the country, and he does not give you the least proof. The most delightful thing about it is this, that his followers take him *au sérieux*; they think him a great statesman; and he himself has not the least suspicion of the thoroughly ridiculous character of his position. (Cheers.) Now, Sir, what did the Canadian Pacific Railway cost us? Some \$55,000,000, as my hon. friend from Lisgar (Ross) very properly pointed out yesterday. How does the hon. gentleman get \$100,000,000 then for the North-West alone? It must be by adding on the land, the land, that is to say, that has come wholly from the North-West. Suppose I concede to him, for argument's sake, that he has a right to say that \$100,000,000 have been spent in the North-West, then I will show him that he has not one tittle of ground to stand upon in saying that the North-West has been a burden to Canada. This sum is arrived at by treating the land subsidies and railways as money spent, but this sum of a hundred millions, if it is to be admitted as correct, has given us a return. From Red River to the foot of the Rockies, that is, in the North-West proper, the Canadian Pacific Railway has cost to construct \$15,767,419, as the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Ross) pointed out very properly yesterday. The land subsidy to the Canadian Pacific Railway was 18,206,986 acres, which at \$2 per acre would amount to \$36,413,972. Deduct the

\$15,767,419 it cost in construction, and you will find a balance of \$20,646,553, which is what the North-West gave towards the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway in the older provinces, as was yesterday most correctly and eloquently pointed out by the hon. member for Lisgar. The value of the new towns and villages in the North-West brought into existence by the Canadian Pacific Railway may be safely placed at \$80,000,000. It is more than that, but I put it at \$80,000,000. I am in a position to prove by actuarial estimates that that is correct. A railway is said to affect land 20 miles on each side. The railway mileage of the North-West is 2,318 miles. Take \$1 per acre as the value added to the land affected by this mileage, and we have an additional value of \$59,340,800. Admitting the figures of the hon. member for South Oxford, what do we have? The accounts stand: To public money sunk in North-West, according to the hon. member for South Oxford, \$100,000,000. By balance of land subsidy given by the North-West Territories towards construction of Canadian Pacific Railway in older provinces, \$20,646,553. Value of new towns created by Canadian Pacific Railway in the North-West, \$80,000,000. Additional value of \$1 per acre, to lands affected by railways in the North-West, \$59,340,800, or a total of \$159,986,353. To this must be added the new wealth created by railroads in the North-West other than the Canadian Pacific Railway, the increase in the value of property in the older provinces caused by the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the benefits direct and indirect of the Canadian Pacific Railway to the whole Dominion, none of which can be put into figures, but it is safe to say that for the outlay of \$100,000,000 the country has received a return of over 200 per cent. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), goes on to say:

"Have we not got our own North-West census returns taken four or five years ago, which show that we have succeeded in placing perhaps 9,000 families in the North-West and Manitoba in five years."

I
wh
cen
inc
fam
fan
cou
cer
hav
trie
bac
at t
of
witt
in h
grav
as in
flow
brin
"M
go h
The
Wes
when
been
lors'
there
and
But
going
in th
breez
once
and
brigh
(Chee
South
ture—
the E
North
inter
000,0
outlay
which
est re
read
the ar
11 ye
revent
separa
expect
return
revent

I look at the North-West census, and what do I find? That our North-West census returns show that there was an increase of 72,600 souls, or, at 5 to a family, 14,520 families. However, 5 to a family is too large a proportion for a new country, and the number of families was certainly much larger. Besides that, we have to deplore, and I deplore I have not tried to mend it by example, a large bachelor immigration. But I remember, at the hospitable board of Mr. Manning, of Toronto, some years ago, telling a witty young lady of the poet Goethe, how in his old age when on the verge of the grave he was as attractive to the fair sex as in his youth, and I said to her: "The flowers of love sometimes bloom on the brink of the grave." "Ah," she said, "Mr. Davin, the frost I think, would go hard with those flowers." (Laughter.) The frost goes hard with life in the North-West, as I can testify from observation, where lovely woman is not found. I have been in many homes, sometimes in bachelors' homes, sometimes in homes where there are families and where woman is, and you can have no idea of the difference. But women are now coming. Men are going East and bringing back wives, and in the North-West, in defiance of the breeze and blizzards, when lovely woman once appears, homes happy, contented, and prosperous spring up beautiful and bright as are to be found in the world. (Cheers.) Then the hon. member for South Oxford claims an annual expenditure—and again I call the attention of the House to this—of \$7,000,000 on the North-West, of which \$4,000,000 is interest on the alleged outlay of \$100,000,000. It has been shown that that outlay has returned \$200,000,000, in which case the \$4,000,000 becomes interest received instead of paid. Now let me read some tables I have prepared to show the annual revenue and expenditure for 11 years for the North-West. The postal revenue and expenditure I place in a separate table, as no sane man would expect the one to cover the other, or to return anything. Now, Sir, here is the revenue derived from Manitoba and the

North-West Territories from 1880 to 1890 inclusive:

Year.	Customs	Excise.	Domin. Lands.	Total.
	\$	\$	\$	\$
1880.....	322,268	66,328	202,165	590,761
1881.....	473,230	97,875	201,052	773,057
1882.....	1,108,679	157,412	1,795,047	3,061,138
1883.....	1,883,656	185,367	1,042,658	3,061,681
1884.....	735,548	157,216	992,556	1,885,320
1885.....	589,208	143,178	439,494	1,176,880
1886.....	488,144	172,239	394,585	1,054,968
1887.....	523,131	211,070	568,990	1,303,191
1888.....	469,886	187,910	563,709	1,221,505
1889.....	574,536	227,289	588,862	1,390,687
1890.....	674,000	254,109	454,327	1,382,436
Totals...	7,792,286	1,864,998	7,244,345	16,901,624

That is not bad from a country which was without any railway communication with the outer world until 1878, when the corduroy railway of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) went bumping into Winnipeg. (Cheers.) What was the expenditure in Manitoba and the North-West during the ten years from 1880 to 1890? I will not go into details, but I will give it in a lump sum. You had an expenditure for Indians of \$10,467,634; and you may remember that we are not chargeable with that, for these Indians are the wards of the whole Dominion of Canada, and if you never got a cent return for that expenditure you could not treat these people with neglect. For Mounted Police we spent \$6,776,007 in these ten years, and for the Dominion Lands \$1,696,394, a total of \$18,940,035. If we deduct the revenue from that we have \$2,033,511 left as a loss—if the hon. gentleman wishes to call it so—but, as I have shown, it is amply met by other considerations. Now, Sir, with such a showing as that, what are you to think of the hon. gentleman who perpetually talks of Manitoba and the North-West as if it were a dead loss upon the hands of the Dominion, and in fact, when we first came down here we used to be told: "We bought you; you are our possession; we purchased you." As a matter of fact, Sir, if you could get all the statistics of the value that the North-West is to Canada,

you would find that at the present moment we are paying our way pretty well. But the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) in the manner in which he deals with the North West, is like an exacting father who has a prosperous and successful son, and who yet is never content with the way things go on. Now, Sir, the total postal revenue in the North-West and Manitoba for these ten years I have referred to was \$1,212,000. and the total postal expenditure was \$2,241,202; leaving a loss in that respect of \$828,980. Nobody supposes that that is a serious matter in dealing with the postal service, for I believe there are parts of Canada long settled where the postal service does not pay; and we must remember that the postal service in any part of Canada cannot be properly considered a local service. (Hear, hear.) In order to have the postal service complete you must reach every civilized part of the country, or otherwise your postal service in the more thickly settled part of the country would not be effective. Therefore you can never take a profit and loss estimate of this service in any given part of the country. That is a point which I particularly wish to impress upon the attention of the House. I do not think that I have had an opportunity before of showing how absurd were the figures of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), but the least analysis of the situation shows that his figures and his calculations are utterly absurd. Mr. Speaker, I do hope that when gentlemen come to speak of that great country in the North-West, which is bound up with the future of Canada more than any other part of the whole Dominion, because it has put back-bone into this Dominion; I do hope that they will escape their sense of despair, that they will forget their feeling of gloom, and that they will separate themselves from these pessimistic views they have been accustomed to; and that they will allow the light of hope and of confidence to break in upon them. It is not in the partizan manner in which this discussion has been conducted that we should talk at this hour, when we stand on a height of prosperity that thirty

years ago could never have been anticipated, a height of prosperity from which we can see further heights, peak rising beyond peak, on which the light of suns that we may not enjoy are already beaming. I say, Sir, that the proper way would be to approach the great problems that are before us as brethren engaged in the great task of building up this young nation. That is the proper feeling to have. We should remember that after all we tread a land that has been trodden from the very first by heroes. This is a young country, but it has a historic past. The men who first explored it were as truly heroes as any men who ever lived in any country, and from Jacques Cartier down, there has been no age in which we have not had men worthy of historical position. When you come to the time when there was a contest as to what race would predominate heroes fought and fell on each side. When you come to the war of 1812 you have for so small a war a larger number of distinguished figures than has ever graced the history of a similar epoch; and when you come to our last little struggle on the banks of the Saskatchewan it was not merely fight, but it was that in the depths of winter our young men, youths unused to arms, marched there in the face of great difficulties, over hundreds of miles of ice and snow, because they wanted to build up a nation. Would to Heaven that we might discuss the issues in this House in the same spirit, as I hope any of us would go, taking our lives in our hands, into the battle for the country in which we live. I remember, Mr. Speaker, in 1870, when I went to Paris to go to the front with McMahon. Just before the last regiments left for the front there was exhibited in one of the windows a splendid painting representing on the right of the canvas the armies of the Empire crossing the Rhine at Ehrenbreitstein, and on the left of the canvas you saw rising before them the ghosts of the triumphant republicans of the Napoleonic era, beckoning their descendants to cross that river, and to advance to battle-fields, and to win victories where they had won them. But Sir, that army did not win victories, and

why? It was not because they were not of the same heroic race. No; they had become luxurious; they had lost faith; and therefore they were beaten. I hope that here in Canada amongst our politicians there will be the same faith that was shown amongst the young soldiers of our country to whom I have referred. If we have faith in the future of Canada, we can advance with confidence against any diffi-

culty that may be before us, and there is no blessing of a free country, no art in which any people ever excelled, and no height to which any nation ever climbed that we may not reach by ambition; and without the least presumption of boastfulness, to use the language of my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier), aspire to, and with certainty attain. (Loud and prolonged cheers).

